DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 643 SP 028 545

AUTHOR Morrison, Harriet B.
TITLE Teacher Education for Moral Leadership.
PUB DATE 31 Oct 86
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the American Educational Studies Association Meeting (Pittsburgh, PA, October 31, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Ethical Instruction; Higher Education; Human Dignity; Individual Development; *Moral Development; *Moral Values; Personal Autonomy; Social Cognition; *Teacher Education; Values Education

ABSTRACT

With a renewed national emphasis on education, its teachers, and their influence, the moral aspect of teacher leadership has surfaced. It is logical to infer that teacher education, its programs, aims, and strategies would powerfully impact the kind or lack of moral leadership demonstrated by its graduates. To gain perspective, morality is defined and described. Education as a moral force as well as moral education are considered. The school as a moral community and the teacher's role are considered. Autonomy as a conceptual theme is related to the rational, aesthetic, and affective aspects of teacher education and their impact on the development of morally aware and sensitive graduates. Twelve implications for teacher education are given. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278643

Teacher Education for Moral Leadership

Harriet B. Morrison
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H.B. Morrison

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 028545

Teacher Education for Moral Leadership

There is a nostalgic ring to the coupling of teacher education with moral leadership. In Plato's Republic as well as in the early days of the common school, teachers were expected to be moral leaders and models. Their education implicitly aided them in the assumption of these roles. Moral leadership as part of a teacher's function diminished with the advent of secular, technical, and skill-oriented education. With a revived national emphasis on education, its teachers, and their influence, the moral aspects of teacher leadership has surfaced. Fundamentalists as well as humanists, relativists along with absolutists, all proffer their conceptions of the teacher as moral leader. It is logical to infer that teacher education, its programs, aims, and strategies would powerfully impact the kind of or lack of moral leadership demonstrated by its graduates.

To gain some perspective on the problem, morality needs definition. Education as a moral force as well as moral education are considered. The school as a functioning

moral community and a consideration of the teacher's vital role contribute to the conceptualization of a teacher education producing moral leaders. Autonomy, as it relates to morality, is a recurring theme.

Moral autonomy of persons, and teachers in particular, arises from the integration of reason, affectivity, and the aesthetics. A teacher education drawing on these fields of human experience can furnish educators able to lead and contribute to a republic, both good and just.

Morality-Defined and Described

Morality has been defined and described by many philosophers, from sometimes opposite perspectives. To Rich, "morality is a system. . . . It concerns how humans treat other beings in order to promote their mutual welfare and the good life."[1] Citing Aristotle, McDonnell holds morality is about the way we live our lives.[2] Relating individuals and morality, Brown contends "like education . . . morality is practical and theoretical and its theoretical background must be in support of practice."[3] It can be concluded that morality includes how humans relate to the world and its inhabitants in a responsible, caring manner. Veatch's inquiry: "must not any really basically human knowledge be thus a moral knowledge?"[4] leads to the consideration of education as a moral force.

Moral Impact of Education

Virtue, character, and a set of attitudes are commonly ascribed to the consequences of a morally influential education. Vandenberg focuses on one's becoming aware of the dignity of other people and respecting each as a unique individual.[5] Casement contends one's life experiences should be enhanced with a proper education emphasizing the humanities.[6] Duska holds that in one sense education is teaching one to belong to a community, and it is a sharing of attitudes. One's learning to view life morally is quite different from using the scientific approach in education.[7] Accustomed to technical skills and efficiency standards, one requires orientation to a way of thinking and relating that is more demanding and absorbing than learning the latest computer program. Virtue and character education, according to Herzbrun, are gained through aesthetic experiences. Reflecting Platonic theory, education leads the soul through the inspiration of Beauty.[8] Education as a moral force is of greater significance in one's existence than all the courses and certificates one accumulates. Its result is who the person is.

Moral Education

Moving from a holistic view of education in its total moral impact to a more explicit discussion of moral education, one finds a plurality of viewpoints and strategies,

all of which have something to contribute to a humanly-based moral education in the curriculum.

Gewirth calls moral education, both formal and informal, that which aims to develop in each person self-esteem, the prudential virtues, and a "respect for the generic rights of others, including an understanding of why they have those rights and how these rights should be implemented . . . ."[9] Action-centered principles demand that educators do what is right and not merely capitulate to the voice of authority nor coast with custom. Whether one automatically judges a child as inferior from a standardized test or insists on abstract, highly verbal strategies when the learners are clearly not functioning in that area suggests a lack of respect for learners' basic rights to learn and to have access to materials and procedures related to their unique set of needs and talents.

Casement focuses on the humanities with an emphasis on a search for common universal elements. Reasoning, primary moral principles, and the humanities as sources comprise his paradigm.[10] Vandenberg, on the other hand, establishes a human rights curriculum which includes rights to equal freedom, equal consideration, and brotherly love and sisterly love in the classroom. Freedom and responsibility are in proportior to the maturity of the learners in a loving, moral community of the classroom.[11]

It is important that freedom be increased qualitatively as well as quantitatively as learners demonstrate strengths in fulfilling their responsibilities. Learners need to know that what they do and think make a difference.

Beyer and Wood hold the central moral principles are equality (access), democracy (participation), and autonomy (empowerment). They relate these to the criteria of universality, consistency, and emancipation, all of which characterize our Western cultural tradition.[12] An educational experience seriously lacking in these moral principles is detrimental to learners and society. Educators must be held to demanding standards if all--the aggressive and reticent, the richly endowed and those with few marketable skills--are to grow as complete moral beings. Vandenberg sounds a similar theme when he holds one's action is right if it enables existing things to persevere in their being. "One ought to let things be what they are, and who they are, in the flow of their becoming. . . . The chief commandment is not to love one's neighbor but to love everything that exists . . . to love the universe insofar as one knows it."[13] This seems to be the quintessential law of moral education.

Drawing from several perspectives on moral education, one concludes that reason, affectivity, and aesthetics are significant constructs in moral education. Again their inclusion and emphases differ. Opting for reason, Beyer

and Wood emphasize the power of self-reflection and the elimination of dogma. To them moral education is consistent with the values of equality, democracy, and autonomy.[14] But Brown counsels for a combination of the rational with attitude and value formation thus eliminating the sterility of a solely reason-based moral education. He contends that moral education must be multi-disciplinary if it is to comprehend the complexity of moral education principles and practices.[15] On the other hand, Cooper strongly advocates Kohlberg's cognitive approach with the utilization of case studies, discussion and attention to the content of Kohlberg's theory. Using theoretical principles as guides in moral reasoning, students grow in the ability to reflect and consider their moral views. They would not be quick to blindly accept institutional rules and practices as automatically good and just.[16] For teachers, growth in moral perception can be guaged by the ability to recognize morally deficient practices and assumptions in the learning environment.

The affective is a source for Vandenberg's human rights moral education which is firmly based on fraternity (brotherly and sisterly love).[17] Morality without the warmth of emotions becomes a punctilious observance of the rules of good conduct. With feelings the other is embraced as a friend

Aesthetics is a channel toward moral growth as expressed by Haldane. Through art activity one utilizes the skills of intelligent behavior, attention, reflection, judgment, and action. From an immersion in art arises the general concepts of truth, objectivity, unity-in-diversity, sensitivity, and Value itself.[18] One learns some thing about oneself and the world through art experiences. To Herzbrun art-for-truth's-sake is discovered through humankind's play impulse, art as a way of knowing.[19] The impact of the beautiful on one's existence suggests that more attention be given to the aesthetic environment of schools, homes, and communities. Working to create something of beauty places the learner in an elemental relationship with questions of value, harmony, and balance necessary in the moral life as well as in the art object.

Autonomy

Autonomy, a recurring motif, runs through the proposals for reason, aesthetics, affectivity, or combinations for moral education programs. Beyer and Wood call it "freedom to do."[20] It is an empowerment to think, choose, and act. Vandenberg describes it as that of people capable of self-government.[21] Brown holds rational autonomy is enriched with attitude formation.[22] Relating to Rawls's moral autonomy as that operating from behind

the veil of ignorance, Cooper holds teachers ought to commit themselves to teaching moral autonomy as part of their professional obligations:

> To regulate education by the principle of moral autonomy may be the best way to protect all children from indoctrination.[23]

The rational educator who can solve the moral dilemma in administrative procedure develops the power of reasoned morality in the young.

In contrast to rationalistic views, Herzbrun refers to Schiller's description of autonomy as self spontaneity.[24] Engagement with an art experience is the channel to freedom and autonomy. The individual learns what it means to be in control. An education aiming for autonomy equips the young for full fledged freedom. Haldane agrees holding autonomy as the aim of education and that the autonomy of teachers is a natural corollary. Autonomy includes

> some set of qualities of mind and character which persons in principle can have despite external restraints in their action.[25]

To him, self-determination is logically linked in that it infers some control over what persons do and what happens to them.[26] Teachers actively pursuing self-determination function within the school affecting and being affected by

the environment (intellectual and cultural). Autonomous self-determiners reappraise and question the rightness of curricular decisions and celebrate the educator as one entitled to question, analyze, and implement individual as well as group proposals.

The School

Mann believes a good school would include two of the major needs of all human beings in their moral life: a rich and wise tradition and a large and loving community. The kind of community in which the school finds itself can support or threaten education's moral force. He fears that the inner city school lacking family and local support is doomed to failure in moral education efforts.[27] One might counter that the fragile environment holds hidden strength and that the larger community can respond, for its own security if for no ther reason.

The Teacher

The teacher in the ghetto school as well as in the affluent suburb, can be a friend, as Mann suggests in the Aristotelian sense, exhibiting magnamimity, generosity of spirit, and helpfulness.[28] The greater the degree of teacher autonomy, the more powerful the role model for the students. According to Haydon, the autonomous teacher would resent encroachments on the powers of self-determination.[29] Class activities bear the stamp of the

teacher's unique talents. Guide books and standardized programs would be secondary. As a group, teachers would be active agents in tenure, hiring, merit awards, and release. They would be equally ready to assume responsibility for their curricular choices and professional activities within the school system. Autonomous teachers are not blind rule followers nor do they allow themselves to be treated as hired hands. The autonomous educator is an authentic individual.

From Duska' point of view, the ethics teacher is ready to take a stand and is able to defend actions not as a demagogue nor indoctrinator but as a reasoning individual.[30] With warmth and respect for others, the teacher displays a holistic autonomy. A pleasantly bland, all accepting educator, does not present a thoughtful, courageous image.

Human dignity in pedagogy, the recognition of the value of each student, is Vandenberg's concept of pedagogic love. The educator as moral agent encourages friendly dialogic relations among students who create a fraternal community of mutually valuing learners. Each shares in the human rights to equal freedom, equal consideration, and brotherly and sisterly love.[31] Reflecting an educator who prized each as a unique existence, learners would accept the other both for individual talents and for the personal contribution to a shared living-learning space.

Human rights are important to Beyer and Wood who contend that democracy, equality, and autonomy receive relatively little attention from teachers.[32] This could relate to the kind of education teachers receive and the functioning of their roles.

In teaching ethics, the educator could agree with Rawls that moral education is education for autonomy which is the ability to live according to principles that would be chosen from behind the veil of ignorance.[33] Teachers growing as moral persons perceive the world from a variety of standpoints. Justice guides their relationships with others be they minorities, women, or simply the overlooked.

Using a cognitively -based approach, such as Kohlberg's, teachers can encourage moral autonomy, the ability to withstand institutional and/or social reinforcers which encourage immoral acts. Teaching for moral autonomy safeguards children from the insinuating power of indoctrination. Cooper suggests case studies, class discussions, and reflective thinking as appropriate strategies.[34]

Moral autonomy is encouraged through the development of thinking persons not automatons. Moral leaders are not reflectors of cultural, social, and institutional environments which demean the human spirit. Morally autonomous persons differentiate the 'is' from the 'ought' in their communications and are active in ameliorating situations destructive to freedom, justice, and mutuality.

Using sound, reason-based principles, students can avoid the emotivism, egocentrism, and naive relativism rampant in today's culture and attain an autonomous moral position. Agreeing with everything or stubbornly resisting the justifications of others describes the morally immature person.

Teacher Education--Conclusions and Implications

What teacher education should do to promote moral leadership can be assessed from what has been discovered concerning morality, education as a moral force, moral education, the school, and the teacher's role. As agents of teacher preparation, colleges and universities can provide course work, inter-departmental sharing, and university-wide planning as contributions to education for moral leadership. Educators, as morally autonomous persons, will assume leadership within their classes and schools as well as being active participants in society.

Philosophy courses can introduce students to Plato, Aristotle, and Dewey as well as the moral theories inherent to utilitarianism, Kantianism, and existentialism. Kohlberg's cognitive moral dilemmas provide the strategy of moral reasoning related to universal moral principles. Ethics courses, like those described by Rich,[35] introduce educators to professional challenges on a normative plane.

On a wider scale the humanities and aesthetics enlarge the perspectives and moral awareness of students. Educationally oriented novels and plays could add telling lessons concerning the responsibilities and influence of educators. History, too, has much to provide in the broad scope of cultural change as well as in pinpointing educators who made a difference. Creating as well as appreciating beauty in its many guises highlight the concepts of truth, consistency, and Value. Affective growth can be merged with the aesthetic in creative production. Emotional sensitivity can be furthered through in-depth dialogue with peers and other persons unfamiliar to the student because of age, race, or social background. Encountering the other as Thou rather than it can be a soul searing experience.

Philosophy of education can be a leader in the program. Working with other philosophers in the liberal arts would be encouraged. Inter-departmental as well as university planning and teaming could be arranged among art departments, music, literary, and performing arts faculties.

Discussions of the gap between what is just and good and that which occurs and is regularly accepted could be wide ranging. Teachers in-service could discuss the incidence of programs mandated and evaluational measures introduced with no input from the practicioners. The

lessening of teacher autonomy in the name of competency, accountability, or excellence is a serious issue and requires independent professional evaluation. As teachers become better educated, their freedom to perform and choose independently as well as a professional group appears to be diminishing. Fundamentalist groups attempt to muzzle teacher's academic freedom in using the dreaded E----word in their biology classes. In some areas teachers are discouraged from innocent gestures of affection to their students. Drawing on a teacher education dedicated to education for moral leadership, educators could present thoughtful and morally-based arguments for their inclusion in the complete educational process from curricular choices, teaching style, and student relationships to meaningful representation in matters of tenure, evaluation, employment, and awards to students , peers, and administrators. The institutional regularities which condone wrongful treatment of individuals and groups would be identified and possible ways of overcoming or at least enduring an immoral situation as a just and caring person would be considered. The educator in his or her relationship with learners, parents, and other teachers would recognize as a moral leader the importance of treating all persons with dignity and as worthy beings. Educational practices would avoid the punitive as well as the misplaced benevolence of not asking

the best from all. The means of access to fulfillment, both individual and group, would be provided. Teacher education itself would be analyzed. Goal implementation would reveal moral attitudes towards faculty and students as well as its relationship to the community. Students would be encouraged to think, reflect, and analyze present and future challenges to the profession and to themselves as productive individuals. They would draw upon their total moral experiences in their teacher education when encountering dilemmas.

Moral issues are appealing to many who sense a moral vacuum in today's society. Teacher education could help to meet these deeply human needs. Teachers strong in their own beliefs would encourage the growth of morally autonomous persons who approach moral dilemmas rationally, affectively, and aesthetically. As whole persons educators can be the leaders who create loving moral communities of learning which ultimately affect society for the better.

Several implications can be drawn concerning teacher education for moral leadership:

1. Teacher education for moral leadership includes the rational, affective, and aesthetic in its teacher preparation.
2. Autonomy in thought and practice is of central significance in the functioning of a morally effective teacher.

3. Moral leadership in the classroom and school emphasizes human rights and human dignity which are appreciated both rationally and affectively.

4. Aesthetic experiences contribute to the development of morally sensitive persons.

5. Moral leadership includes a respect for democracy with its right of freedom and its obligation of responsibility for one's acts.

6. The teacher as moral leader defends his/her principles but without demagogy or indoctrination.

7. The teacher as moral leader organizes the class activities in consonance with the highest professional standards and creates a unique and productive learning encironment for all students.

8. The teacher as moral leader is a participant in the democratic processes of the community.

9. The teacher as moral leader individually and as a member of a profession seeks to contribute to the educational process and accepts responsibilities for these activities.

10. Moral leaders teach so that their students can attain moral autonomy through rational, affective, and aesthetic activities.

11. The educator as moral leader respects each person and the potential within each individual.

12. Teacher education through college and university-wide

planning can provide education for moral leadership.

References

1. John Martin Rich, Professional Ethics in Education (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1984), p. 122.

2. Kevin McDonnell, "Moral Formation and the Liberal Arts," in The Georgetown Symposium on Ethics, Essays in Honor of Henry Babcock Veatch, ed. Rocco Porreco (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1984), p. 248.

3. L. M. Brown, "Moral Education Theory and Research," Educational Philosophy and Theory 16 (October 1984):15.

4. Henry B. Veatch, "Can Philosophy Ever Be a Thing for Hoosiers?" in The Georgetown Symposium on Ethics, p. 6.

5. Donald Vandenberg, "Human Dignity, Three Human Rights, and Pedagogy," Educational Theory 36 (Winter 1986):35.

6. William Casement, "The Poverty of Moral Education Today: Where Has All the Content Gone?" in The Georgetown Symposium on Ethics, p. 257.

7. Ronald Duska, "The New Sophists: Emotivists as Teachers of Ethics," in The Georgetown Symposium on Ethics, p. 241.

8. Philip Herzbrun, "The Case for Esthetics and Ethical Values," in The Georgetown Symposium on Ethics, pp. 280, 281.

9. Alan Gewirth, Reason and Morality (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978), p. 319.

10. Casement, "The Poverty of Moral Education Today,"

pp. 256-258.

11. Vandenberg, "Human Dignity":40-42.

12. Landon E. Beyer and George H. Wood, "Critical Inquiry and Moral Action in Education," Educational Theory 36 (Winter 1986):7-10.

13. Donald Vandenberg, Human Rights in Education (New York: Philosophical Library, 1983), p. 49.

14. Beyer and Wood, "Critical Inquiry and Moral Action": 11.

15. L. M. Brown, "Moral Education Theory and Research": 11, 18.

16. David E. Cooper, "Cognitive Development and Teaching Business Ethics," Journal of Business Ethics 4 (1985): 313-322.

17. Vandenberg, "Human Dignity, Three Human Rights, and Pedagogy":33-42.

18. John J. Haldane, "Concept-Formation and Value Education," Educational Philosophy and Theory 16 (October, 1984):26.

19. Herzbrun, "The Case for Esthetics and Ethical Values," pp. 281-283.

20. Beyer and Wood, "Critical Inquiry and Moral Action":10.

21. Vandenberg, "Human Dignity, Three Human Rights, and Pedagogy":36.

22. Brown, "Moral Education Theory and Research":13.

23. Cooper, "Cognitive Development and Teaching Business

Ethics":322,323.

24. Herzbrun, "The Case for Esthetics and Ethical Values," p. 282.

25. Graham Haydon, "Autonomy as an Aim of Education and the Autonomy of Teachers," Journal of Philosophy of Education 17 (1983):220.

26. Ibid.

27. Jesse A. Mann, "The Proper Context of Moral Education," in The Georgetown Symposium on Ethics, pp. 264-267.

28. Ibid., p. 266.

29. Haydon, "Autonomy as an Aim of Education":222.

30. Duska, "The New Sophists: Emotivists as Teachers of Ethics," p. 237.

31. Vandenberg, "Human Dignity, Three Human Rights and Pedagogy":41, 42.

32. Beyer and Wood, "Critical Inquiry and Moral Action in Education":8.

33. Cooper, "Cognitive Development and Teaching Business Ethics":322.

34. Ibid.:322, 323.

35. Rich, Professional Ethics in Education, pp. 129-131.